

Final Conference Call Minutes



Aquatic Settlement Work Group

To: Aquatic SWG Parties **Date:** November 12, 2014
From: Michael Schiewe, Chair (Anchor QEA, LLC)
Re: Final Minutes of the October 8, 2014 Aquatic SWG Conference Call

The Aquatic Settlement Work Group (SWG) met by conference call on Wednesday, October 8, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A of these meeting minutes.

I. Summary of Action Items

1. Anchor QEA will distribute meeting information for a conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to further discuss Wells white sturgeon stocking plans and the Aquatic SWG Chair position candidates (Items VI-3 and VI-6). *(Note: Kristi Geris distributed a meeting invite for this conference call, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG following the conference call on October 8, 2014.)*
2. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) will provide a response to the Colville Confederated Tribes' (CCT's) email requesting clarification of the technical basis for WDFW's position on the 2015-2017 white sturgeon stocking plans in the Wells Pool by Friday, October 17, 2014 (Item VI-3).
3. Douglas PUD will provide a revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program Statement of Agreement (SOA) to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-3). *(Note: Andrew Gingerich provided a revised SOA, as well as a Microsoft Excel file containing a formula to help calculate stocking values, to Geris following the meeting on October 8, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*
4. Aquatic SWG members will review the résumés and curriculum vitae (CVs) of the five Aquatic SWG Chair candidates and will rank the candidates first to last (1 to 5) for filling the Chair position; Aquatic SWG members will provide their rankings to Kristi Geris (with a copy to Mike Schiewe) by Tuesday, October 21, 2014, and Geris will compile the results for discussion at the Aquatic SWG conference call scheduled for Wednesday, October 22, 2014 (Item VI-6).
5. Jason McLellan will determine whether the CCT prefer anonymity regarding the Aquatic SWG Chair candidate selection process, and once determined, Kristi Geris will

distribute an email to the Aquatic SWG clarifying how the rankings will be presented during the Aquatic SWG conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014 (Item VI-6).
(Note: McLellan clarified that anonymity is not necessary for the CCT via email on October 9, 2014, and Geris distributed an email that same day, as discussed.)

II. Summary of Decisions

1. There were no decisions approved during today's conference call.

III. Agreements

1. The Aquatic SWG members present agreed to meet by conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to further discuss Wells white sturgeon stocking and the Aquatic SWG Chair position candidates (Items VI-3 and VI-6).

IV. Review Items

1. Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG following the meeting on October 8, 2014, notifying them that the draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan is available for a 30-day review period with comments due to Chas Kyger no later than Friday, November 7, 2014 (Item VI-4).
2. Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG following the meeting on October 8, 2014, notifying them that the Aquatic SWG Chair qualifications document (originally distributed on September 10, 2014) is still available for review with comments due to Andrew Gingerich as soon as possible (Item VI-6).

V. Documents Finalized

1. There are no documents that have been recently finalized.

VI. Summary of Discussions

1. **Welcome, Review Agenda, Meeting Minutes Approval, and Review of Action Items** (Mike Schiewe): Mike Schiewe welcomed the Aquatic SWG members (attendees are listed in Attachment A) and opened the meeting. Schiewe reviewed the agenda and asked for additions or other changes to the agenda. No additions or changes were requested.

The revised draft September 10, 2014 conference call minutes were reviewed. Kristi Geris said that all comments and revisions received from members of the Aquatic SWG were incorporated in the revised minutes, and that there were no outstanding edits or questions to address. Aquatic SWG members present approved the September 10, 2014 conference call minutes, as revised.

Action items from the last Aquatic SWG meeting on September 10, 2014, and follow-up discussions were as follows: (Note: italicized item numbers below correspond to agenda items from the September 10, 2014 meeting.)

- *The Yakama Nation (YN) and WDFW will provide recommended revisions to the White Sturgeon Stocking Protocol document, including an explanation of the technical basis for any revisions, to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by September 29, 2014, for consideration and approval during the Aquatic SWG conference call on October 8, 2014 (Item VI-2).*
This will be discussed further during today's conference call.
- *Douglas PUD will provide a draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by September 12, 2014 (Item VI-5).*
Douglas PUD provided the draft plan for review on September 12, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day. This will be discussed further during today's conference call.
- *Aquatic SWG members will review Douglas PUD's email that was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris prior to the meeting on September 10, 2014, regarding the Aquatic SWG Chair position, and will: 1) provide edits and comments on the qualifications document to Andrew Gingerich (with a copy to Geris) by September 29, 2014; 2) contact qualified candidates to gauge interest in the position; and 3) obtain a résumé or CV from interested parties to discuss at the Aquatic SWG meeting on October 8, 2014 (Item VI-6).*
This will be discussed further during today's conference call.

2. **Total Dissolved Gas Reduction Alternative Analysis Document** (Andrew Gingerich):

Andrew Gingerich notified Aquatic SWG members that they will soon receive a document for review that is a requirement under the Wells Hydroelectric Project Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification, and is due to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) in December 2014. Gingerich explained that the due date to Ecology is based on the filing and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approval of the Douglas PUD Water Quality Attainment Plan, which occurred in December of 2013. He said that the document will be distributed prior to the November Aquatic SWG conference call, for a 30-day review period, with comments due to him. He said the document considers and discusses alternative structural and operational modifications at the Wells Project that might be made in order to obtain compliance with water quality standards, specifically Total Dissolved Gas (TDG) standards. Pat Irle added that the document also addresses potential impacts to fish species.

3. **Sturgeon** (Andrew Gingerich):

Sturgeon Path Forward

Andrew Gingerich said that per the YN and WDFW action item from the last Aquatic SWG meeting, they discussed white sturgeon stocking in the Wells Pool and

WDFW provided a recommendation to Douglas PUD on October 6, 2014, which Kristi Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day. Gingerich summarized that the recommendation distributed by WDFW (Chad Jackson) via email on October 6, 2014 was to release equal numbers of direct gamete-origin and larval-origin fish. He said that WDFW also indicated their plan to provide a revised document for review and approval.

Gingerich said that in the interest of staying on track and anticipating other technical members disagreement with the proposed 50/50 split approach, he developed a revised draft SOA for a Wells White Surgeon Stocking Program Brood Year (BY) 2015 (Attachment B), which Kristi Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG prior to the meeting on October 8, 2014. Gingerich said that the thought behind this draft SOA was to develop a document that meets all Aquatic SWG members' objectives, including: 1) moving genes from the lower river upstream; 2) achieving a genetically based split through parental representation; and 3) meeting the stocking target of 5,000 fish. He reviewed the draft SOA and summarized that the approach involves calculating the numbers of fish from each source to be stocked based on number of parents estimated to be the sires of the offspring in each program. Donella Miller (YN) noted an error in the draft SOA, and clarified that five-by-five and three-by-five factorial crosses were achieved for the direct gamete brood program—not three-by-three and one-by-three, as reported in Attachment B. Gingerich agreed and recalculated that five-by-five and three-by-five factorial crosses would equal 18 parents—not 10. He said that calculating the number of parents for a larval program is more difficult, but can be estimated as described in the paper *Estimates of Effective Number of Breeding Adults and Reproductive Success for White Sturgeon* (Jay et al. 2014; Attachment C), which Geris also distributed to the Aquatic SWG prior to the meeting on October 8, 2014. Gingerich noted that the paper was peer-reviewed and the research was done in a robust way. He explained that Jay et al. (2014) collected eggs and larvae in Lake Roosevelt at three locations upstream of the Canadian/United States border and genotyped all fish in a calibrated pedigree analysis to obtain the adult spawner estimate. He said that from a small sample size collected in locations close and immediately upstream to where white sturgeon larvae were collected in 2014 for the Douglas PUD white sturgeon program, Jay et al. (2014) estimated that 97 parents contributed to production. Gingerich suggested using this estimate for the Wells sturgeon program. He reviewed the formula depicted in the draft SOA, and explained that $N^L = 97$, $N^{DG} = 18$, and $N^R = 5,000$. He said that solving for $N^{F/A}$ will provide the number of fish to be stocked per adult. Jason McLellan noted that switching the numerator and denominator will avoid generating a proportion that would need to be further calculated. Gingerich agreed. McLellan said that using the values that Gingerich described above results in about 780 direct gamete-origin fish and about 4,220 larval-origin fish. Gingerich agreed, clarifying that the denominator would equal 115 total adults, which equals about 43.47 offspring per adult.

Patrick Verhey said that WDFW has no comments at this time, and that he will defer to Chad Jackson (WDFW) as he has been closely involved in these discussions. Pat Irle said that Ecology has no comments at this time. Bob Rose expressed appreciation for the effort Douglas PUD has put toward reaching agreement on this issue, and said that he will need to review this draft SOA with Miller prior to commenting. Miller agreed, and said that she has some initial thoughts, but would like to discuss internally before commenting. McLellan said he believes that the draft SOA is a novel approach and is worth considering. He said that the CCT do not support the WDFW recommendation, and still want WDFW to respond to the CCT email that Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG on October 6, 2014. McLellan reiterated that the CCT requested technical evidence that: 1) the sturgeon population in the John Day Pool has higher observed genetic diversity than all pools above McNary Dam; 2) the BY 2014 direct gamete take offspring derived from John Day Pool parents possess “different” alleles than those found in the Trans Boundary population; 3) supports or explains why WDFW believes that the “different” alleles suspected to exist within the John Day population are important for program success considering they are non-selective alleles at 13 microsatellite loci; and 4) justifies WDFW’s reasoning supporting a 50/50 split in release numbers from a genetic perspective. McLellan said that the CCT are skeptical of the benefit of bringing genetics upstream. He added that the CCT are not necessarily opposed to it, but they would like to see evidence of a benefit.

Gingerich reiterated that the draft SOA that Douglas PUD proposes seems to meet each Aquatic SWG member’s priorities, which include: 1) a commitment to stocking 5,000 fish; 2) moving genetics upstream; and 3) genetic diversity. Gingerich encouraged Aquatic SWG members to share and consider this draft SOA with their respective Policy Representatives. He added that he hopes the Aquatic SWG recognizes the commitment that Douglas PUD has in meeting the objectives of all Aquatic SWG members.

Mike Schiewe asked if there is a need to continue this discussion prior to the next Aquatic SWG meeting. He asked at what point Douglas PUD will need to manage the population on station. Gingerich replied that Hatchery Staff will need to begin culling in the next month or two. He added, however, that his larger concern is that the Aquatic SWG members will become busy with other obligations, and that this discussion will need to be repeated at next month’s meeting. He suggested convening a conference call to discuss the draft SOA further, after giving Aquatic SWG members an opportunity to review and discuss the SOA internally. Schiewe also noted the CCT do not support the WDFW proposal, and that needs to be resolved as well. The Aquatic SWG members present agreed to meet by conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., to further discuss a Wells white sturgeon stocking protocol. Anchor QEA will distribute meeting information

for this conference call. *(Note: Geris distributed a meeting invite for this conference call, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG following the conference call on October 8, 2014.)*

Schiewe said that if the Aquatic SWG cannot reach agreement on Wells white sturgeon stocking, this may be taken to the Policy level, and if not resolved at the Policy level, the decision falls back to the responsible party, which would be Douglas PUD. Schiewe noted that this route would not be consistent with the spirit and intent of the Aquatic SWG.

Irle said that she would like WDFW to provide a response to the CCT email requesting clarification on the technical basis for the WDFW position on the 2015-2017 white sturgeon stocking plans in the Wells Pool prior to the conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014. Gingerich agreed, and Verhey said that he would relay this request to Jackson and hopefully have a response by Friday, October 17, 2014.

McLellan asked Miller to clarify if any males were reused in the matrices for the brood program or if 18 unique individuals were used. Miller replied that only unique individuals were used. McLellan also requested that Douglas PUD provide a revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program SOA with a corrected formula. *(Note: Gingerich provided a revised SOA, as well as a Microsoft Excel file containing a formula to help calculate stocking values, to Geris following the meeting on October 8, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*

Brood Year 2014 Sturgeon Fish Health and Wells Hatchery Status Update

Gingerich said that fish health samples were obtained from both direct gamete-origin and larval-origin fish at Wells Hatchery; however, samples have not yet been analyzed. He said that both direct gamete-origin and larval-origin fish are doing well. He said that currently, survival of the 2014 direct gamete-origin fish on station at Wells Hatchery is about 60% of the approximate 110,000 fish that were originally brought on station. He said that survival of the 2014 larval-origin fish is about 56% of the approximate 17,000 fish that were originally brought on station. He added that for larval-origin fish, survival would be higher, but Tank 7 is not doing well. He recalled that last year, White Sturgeon Iridovirus (WSIV) affected Tank 7, and secondary infections occurred. He said that there are about 10,000 larval-origin fish left on station, and all are doing well. He said they are all feeding well, and are on cold water to manage risk of secondary infection with other pathogens.

Gingerich summarized that about 120,000 fish are still on station. He said that this highlights the need to resolve sturgeon stocking so hatchery staff can finish the rearing/grow-out phase for these fish. McLellan asked if it is possible for WSIV to go dormant and then resurface. Gingerich said that he was not certain, but said that hatchery staff thoroughly cleaned and bleached the tanks between uses. He added that

perhaps the low survival in the tank is just coincidence since two years in a row with high losses in Tank 7 does not provide enough samples to suggest cause and effect.

4. **Draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan Comments Summary**
(Andrew Gingerich): Andrew said that Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on September 12, 2014, notifying them that the draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan is available for review. Gingerich said that he is not aware of any comments received to date, and he asked Aquatic SWG members to submit comments on the draft plan, if they have not already done so. He added that approval of this plan will be requested during the Aquatic SWG meeting on November 12, 2014. *(Note: Geris distributed a notification to the Aquatic SWG following the meeting on October 8, 2014, indicating that the draft plan is available for a 30-day review period with comments due to Chas Kyger no later than Friday, November 7, 2014.)*

Mike Schiewe said that during the past few HCP Coordinating Committees meetings, there has been discussion about reopening the low-level side entrance at Wells Dam; however, there has not been a formal request and discussion within the Aquatic SWG. Schiewe said that at some point, the Aquatic SWG will need to address this. Gingerich agreed, and said that he plans to meet with engineers to discuss this, and that he last heard that the HCP Coordinating Committees might be supportive of reopening the entrance. Schiewe clarified that the HCP Coordinating Committees had not yet reached that level of discussion. He said that Bryan Nordlund (formerly National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]) provided an email that described past events leading up to closing the entrance; however, the exact dates were unclear. Schiewe said that the HCP Coordinating Committees understand that reopening the entrance could potentially benefit Pacific lamprey, but that there was also a reason behind closing the entrance, possibly in the interest of improving salmonid passage.

Gingerich said that the differences between the low-level and side entrances at Wells Dam can be confusing. He said that the low-level entrance opens access to the c-channel that runs across the face of the dam and provides a low-level entrance into the collection gallery immediately downstream of Weir 1, opposed to the main front entrance. He said that the side entrance is located above the lower level entrance and looks very similar to the current collection gallery entrance in size and elevation. He clarified that Douglas PUD is only proposing to reopen the c-channel, and to do it in a way that would: 1) address Nordlund's concerns; 2) prevent salmon from accessing it; and 3) provide flows so lamprey can use it. Gingerich reiterated that formal approval for this proposed action will be needed from both the HCP Coordinating Committees and the Aquatic SWG.

Patrick Verhey asked if the lamprey enumeration structure depicted in the draft plan is intended to encourage lamprey to pass via a particular route by providing protection

from light and higher flows. Gingerich replied that yes, the intent was to provide a darker area with lower velocities to assist lamprey passage. Verhey noted that the top view of the conceptual drawing, as depicted in Figure 4 in the draft plan, is confusing because it seems that the vertical bar that would encourage lamprey to move up the ramp to the count window is perpendicular to flow; Verhey recalled that the vertical bar is actually parallel to flow. Gingerich said that these types of comments are helpful, and to please provide them to Kyger.

5. **Resident Fish Study Update** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that this year's Resident Fish Study effort was recently completed. He said that Douglas PUD contracted HDR Engineering, Inc., to conduct this work. He said that results are pending, and that a draft report will soon be provided to the Aquatic SWG for review. Mike Schiewe asked if the report is a FERC requirement. Gingerich replied that yes, the report is required under the Resident Fish Management Plan, and once approved by the Aquatic SWG, the report will be submitted to FERC. He said that the report is a Year 2 license requirement.

6. **Aquatic SWG Chair Position Candidate Discussion** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on September 10, 2014, which contained information and documents regarding the Aquatic SWG Chair position, including an Aquatic SWG Chair qualifications document. This qualifications document was available for review with comments due to Gingerich (with a copy to Geris) no later than September 29, 2014. Gingerich said that no comments have been received to date. Pat Irle said that she had comments, but has not had a chance to send them. She said that one comment was regarding the bullet that states "Attend regional meetings, if and when necessary and agreed to by the Aquatic SWG." She asked what was meant by "regional meetings." Gingerich explained that sometimes, there are regional meetings (e.g., the 2013 Mid-Columbia Regional Sturgeon Workshop), where it is beneficial to have the Aquatic SWG Chair or technical support in attendance in order to capture the meeting minutes for the administrative record, at the Aquatic SWG's request. Irle asked if she could send her other comments via email, and Gingerich agreed to extend the comment period for this document. He added that Douglas PUD is not requesting formal approval of this document, but to please submit comments, as needed. *(Note: Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG following the meeting on October 8, 2014, notifying them that the Aquatic SWG Chair qualifications document [originally distributed on September 10, 2014] is still available for review with comments due to Gingerich as soon as possible.)*

Gingerich recalled that Douglas PUD provided the résumés and CVs of potential candidates to Geris on September 10, 2014, which she distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day. Gingerich also recalled that Aquatic SWG members were asked to:

- 1) contact qualified candidates to gauge interest in the position; and
- 2) obtain a résumé

or CV from interested parties to discuss during today's Aquatic SWG meeting. Gingerich said that Douglas PUD provided the names of four candidates, and Irle provided one additional candidate, for a total of five candidates. Gingerich suggested presenting and discussing each candidate for Aquatic SWG consideration. Aquatic SWG members agreed that this is a good path forward.

Gingerich said that Douglas PUD is interested in someone with a technical background, experience in forum-based discussions, and a background in the topics that are commonly discussed by the Aquatic SWG. The five Aquatic SWG Chair candidates were discussed as follows:

Dr. Peter Bisson

Gingerich said that Dr. Pete Bisson is an accomplished researcher, was formerly employed with the U.S. Forest Service and private industry, and now owns a small, one-man consulting firm in Olympia, Washington. Bisson has a background and interests in several of the topics that are discussed by the Aquatic SWG. Mike Schiewe added that Bisson spent the majority of his early career working as an Aquatic Biologist for the Weyerhaeuser Company in Tacoma, Washington, before moving to the U.S. Forest Service. Schiewe also noted that Bisson served on the Northwest Power Planning Council and NMFS Independent Scientific Advisory Board.

Dr. John Ferguson

Gingerich indicated that he had not worked directly with Dr. John Ferguson; however, Douglas PUD has and was impressed by those experiences. Ferguson's CV indicates a wide range of technical background. Gingerich added that, in addition to his technical qualifications, Ferguson is currently employed by Anchor QEA and as such offers continuity under the existing contract with Douglas PUD that supports the Aquatic SWG. Gingerich noted that continuity is not the highest priority, but it is an important consideration. Schiewe added that Ferguson has been his colleague at both NMFS and Anchor QEA. Ferguson has a diverse set of experiences, also working for the Bonneville Power Administration and for the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE). Schiewe noted that Ferguson was selected to be the new Director of the Fish Ecology Division of NMFS' Northwest Fisheries Science Center, when Schiewe retired from the position. He said that much of the work entailed salmonid species; however, a lot also involved non-salmonid species.

Geoff McMichael

Gingerich said that Mr. Geoff McMichael formerly worked for Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and recently started his own consulting firm. McMichael also regularly presents at the USACE Annual Fish Evaluation Program Meetings. McMichael's most recent research includes survival and estuary studies using Juvenile Salmon Acoustic Telemetry System applications. Prior to his employment at PNNL,

McMichael worked for WDFW, which Gingerich noted, speaks well to his diverse background in fisheries. Bob Rose said that he has worked with McMichael, and knows that McMichael has a lot of experience in hydroelectric project processes.

Bryan Nordlund

Gingerich said that Mr. Bryan Nordlund has participated in the HCP Coordinating Committees for several years. Nordlund's background is predominantly in fish passage, but he is a highly sought-out civil engineer and is well-respected by his peers. Nordlund has extensive experience with topics applicable to issues addressed by the Aquatic SWG. Rose noted that he likes the continuity of Nordlund. Schiewe said that Nordlund recently retired from NMFS, where he played a lead role writing the fish passage standards for the agency. These standards have been published for the Northwest Region, and will also soon be adopted by the Southwest Region. Schiewe added that Nordlund is a well-qualified candidate.

Dr. Tracy Hillman

Irle said that Dr. Tracy Hillman currently facilitates the Rocky Reach Fish Forum (RRFF) and Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF). Hillman has a Ph.D. in Ecological Sciences, and leads his company, BioAnalysts, Inc. Hillman is well-versed in the issues that are discussed in the RRFF and PRFF, specifically regarding lamprey and white sturgeon. Irle suggested that Hillman would be a natural fit to facilitate all three projects. Irle also indicated that Hillman seems unbiased and is willing to conduct additional research, as requested. Rose noted that he also likes the continuity of Hillman. Schiewe added that Hillman is strong in the field of statistical analyses. Patrick Verhey asked if Hillman expressed interest in the position, and Irle indicated that he did.

Verhey asked if any of the candidates had experience with FERC proceedings, besides Nordlund and Hillman. Verhey noted McMichael's experience with USACE, and asked how that compares with how FERC operates. Rose said that he is uncertain about how much experience McMichael has with FERC proceedings. He added that he is not terribly concerned with a lack of FERC experience in these candidates, as he believes they are all capable of quickly coming up to speed. He also noted that he does not believe the Aquatic SWG will be lacking with any of these candidates. Schiewe agreed with Rose, noting the strong candidate list.

Rose asked if there are any candidates that an Aquatic SWG member feels strongly about eliminating, and he added that he is only trying to figure out how to narrow this pool of strong candidates. Jason McLellan said that he agrees with everyone's comments regarding this strong group of candidates, and added that any one of them could likely do a good job. He said that he does not have a favorite, nor is he opposed to any one of them. Gingerich said that making a decision will be difficult. He recalled mentioning last month that there may be value in some carryover between the HCPs

and the Aquatic SWG, as Schiewe has done, and Gingerich added that the HCP Committees are also in the process of identifying a replacement for Schiewe. Gingerich said that this might be another consideration; that is, who is interested in chairing both a HCP Committee(s) and the Aquatic SWG. He said that he believes Bisson is only interested in chairing the Aquatic SWG, and that he would have to check with the others. Gingerich said there have been several times when it has been beneficial to have Schiewe involved in all Committees, where it has prevented scope creep, and also provided carryover for certain topics that need to be jointly approved.

Gingerich noted that another consideration is how these candidates will fill the administrative component. He said that a candidate may be capable of recording the meeting minutes and chairing the meeting at the same time; however, it is his preference to separate those roles so that the Chair can focus on the discussion. He said that there are also organizational functions outside of the meetings, which are all key to this position. He said that he is not certain how each candidate would handle the administrative work, but that he did make it clear that there is a fairly large administrative component to consider. Rose agreed with Gingerich and complimented Geris on the administrative support that she has provided to the Aquatic SWG, and he added that he does not want to lose that support.

Rose asked if the HCP chairs will be selected by the HCP Policy Committee, and if the Aquatic SWG Chair will be selected by the Aquatic SWG. Schiewe said that is correct, and he further clarified that the Aquatic SWG is unique to Douglas PUD, where Douglas PUD is the sole contractor for the Chair and associated work. He said that under the HCPs, all three Committees are jointly funded by both Douglas PUD and Chelan PUD; hence, the desire to start at the Policy level. He recalled that 10 years ago, the hiring process was to review and consider a long list of candidates, reduce the list to two to four candidates, then an interview team composed of individuals from each HCP Committees reviewed and considered the short list and ultimately identified a selection.

Gingerich asked Aquatic SWG members if anyone would like to add to the current candidate pool. Verhey said that he believes the current pool is a good group to choose from and that WDFW has no additional suggestions. No other members expressed a desire to add to the current list of candidates. Gingerich suggested following the same process as was done 10 years ago as a path forward. Irle noted that among all of these strong candidates, it will be difficult to eliminate a candidate prior to an interview. She added that often times, the interview can really help with making a selection; so, she suggested interviewing all candidates. Gingerich noted that conducting five interviews may be asking the Aquatic SWG for too much of their time. Rose said that he does not disagree with Irle, but that he also agrees with Gingerich. Rose said that he would like to take some time to consider the current candidates and narrow the list. He also suggested adding this as a second agenda item for the conference call scheduled for

October 22, 2014. Gingerich agreed with Rose, and further suggested that the Aquatic SWG members each submit their top three preferences for discussion. McLellan suggested developing a standardized scoring based on the job description, and individually scoring each candidate. Irle said that she finds that scoring systems tend to be subject to bias, sometimes unintentionally, but nevertheless only marginally useful. She suggested instead prioritizing the candidates (e.g., 1 to 5). McLellan said that he had suggested scoring because bias inherent in prioritization is also a limitation. He added, however, that he understands Irle's concerns and that he has no preference one way or the other. Gingerich noted that also with scoring, some Aquatic SWG members do not know all of the candidates. McLellan said that scoring should be based on the CVs.

Schiewe summarized that the current proposed path forward is for each Aquatic SWG member to select their top three candidates for discussion during the conference call on October 22, 2014. Rose also suggested that during the conference call, three candidates can be narrowed to two, and then perhaps a ranking system can be developed for the interview. Aquatic SWG members present agreed to meet by conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to further discuss the Aquatic SWG Chair position candidates.

Schiewe suggested that for the interview stage, interview questions would need to be developed in advance. He also asked, if it might be more helpful to rank all five candidates, as Irle had suggested. McLellan agreed that ranking all five would be useful. Gingerich agreed as well. Irle also suggested that Aquatic SWG members provide their respective rankings to Schiewe to compile prior to the conference call on October 22, 2014. Schiewe agreed that this would be helpful, and suggested sending the rankings to Geris. Aquatic SWG members agreed to review the résumés and CVs of the five Aquatic SWG Chair candidates and rank the candidates first to last (1 to 5) for filling the Chair position. Aquatic SWG members will then provide their rankings to Geris (with a copy to Schiewe) by Tuesday, October 21, 2014, and Geris will compile the results for discussion during the Aquatic SWG conference call scheduled for Wednesday, October 22, 2014.

Schiewe asked if there is any preference for the rankings to remain anonymous, or if the rankings should be attributed to the respective agencies. McLellan said that considering the CCT have contracted with some of the candidates, he would like to first discuss this internally. He said that he will determine whether the CCT prefer anonymity regarding the Aquatic SWG Chair candidate selection process. Schiewe said that once determined, Geris will distribute an email to the Aquatic SWG clarifying how the rankings will be presented during the Aquatic SWG conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014. Gingerich noted that a benefit of linking rankings to respective agencies is to be transparent about where the votes came from. *(Note: McLellan indicated via email on*

October 9, 2014, that the CCT find it acceptable to identify the rankings for the Aquatic SWG Chair position by agency, and Geris distributed an email to the Aquatic SWG that same day clarifying that rankings will be compiled by agency.)

Verhey asked which candidates are interested in chairing both the Aquatic SWG and a HCP Committee(s). McLellan said that although an important consideration, he was unsure how to coordinate among the different HCP parties and representatives. McLellan asked how far along the HCP parties are in their Chair selection processes, and if they have identified any of the same candidates. Schiewe said that the HCPs are not far along; that they are still trying to convene an initial meeting of HCP Policy Committee members. He said that currently, the candidate pools are largely the same for both the HCP Hatchery Committees and HCP Coordinating Committees, and include the following similar candidates: Dr. Ferguson, Mr. McMichael, and Mr. Nordlund. Schiewe said that the HCP Coordinating Committees have one additional candidate, Bill Muir, a retired NMFS employee who worked in the Columbia River as a researcher for the Fish Ecology Division. Schiewe said that Muir was involved in several juvenile salmonid survival studies, and worked with the Independent Scientific Advisory Board. Schiewe noted that the HCP Coordinating and Hatchery Committees are still at the stage of requesting additional candidates. He also said that it is his understanding that Bisson was asked about the HCP Hatchery Committees, but he indicated that he was not interested.

VII. Next Meetings

1. **Upcoming meetings** (Mike Schiewe): Upcoming meetings are as follows:
*October 22, 2014 (conference call); November 12, 2014 (conference call);
December 10, 2014 (conference call); January 14, 2015 (TBD).*

List of Attachments

Attachment A – List of Attendees

Attachment B – Draft SOA for Wells White Surgeon Stocking Program BY 2015

Attachment C – Estimates of Effective Number of Breeding Adults and Reproductive Success for White Sturgeon (Jay et al. 2014)

Attachment A List of Attendees

Name	Role	Organization
Mike Schiewe	SWG Chair	Anchor QEA, LLC
Kristi Geris	Administration/Technical Support	Anchor QEA, LLC
Andrew Gingerich	SWG Technical Representative	Douglas PUD
Patrick Verhey	SWG Technical Representative	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pat Irle	SWG Technical Representative	Washington State Department of Ecology
Jason McLellan	SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes
Bob Rose	SWG Technical Representative	Yakama Nation
Donella Miller	Technical Support	Yakama Nation
RD Nelle	Technical Support	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service